

RESPONSE

1. **Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 1, the word “a” should be “the”. Appropriate correction is required. Done.**
2. **Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 1, the word “a” should be “the”. Appropriate correction is required. Done.**
3. **Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 1, the word “a” should be “the”. Appropriate correction is required. Done.**
4. **Claim 32 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75C as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 32 has been canceled.**
5. **Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 3, the phrase “on apparatuses” should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required. Done. As per the telephone conversation, claim 39 has been inserted into claim 33, and claim 39 is now canceled.**
6. **Claims 33-34, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Birs (US 5383315)...The examiner further notes that the drilled-out annulus is never positively claimed, it is merely mentioned in nested intended use language within the preamble. Therefore the structure of the claim only has to be capable of performing the function of fitting into the annulus, which because of its hollow core it can. As per the telephone conversation, the applicant has inserted “the open end of the cylinder has a generally smooth opening and diameter to fit over the core and into the annulus left by a coring bit” from claim 35 into independent claim 33. This positively claims “fitting over the core and into the annulus”. Claim 35 is now canceled.**
7. **Claims 24-25, 28, and 30-31 are allowed. The applicant respectfully thanks the examiner for the help in getting these claims allowed.**

Appn. Number 09/690,657 (Thompson); Art Unit 3635, Examiner: Mark R. Wendell

8. **Claims 35 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.** As per the telephone conversation, the applicant has moved the limitations from claims 35 and 39 into independent claim 33. In claim 39, line 3, the applicant has changed "hooks" to "fasteners". The applicant's Figures 17-27 show bayonets, hooks, and loops. The applicant's specification for these figures also describes several means of latching and locking. Claims 35 and 39 are now canceled.
9. Accordingly, since the applicant perceives that the amended claims read over the cited reference, the applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

Very Respectfully,



Thomas C. Thompson

92-543 Kokole Pl.

Makakilo, Hi 96707

(808) 672-3107